SINGLE BENCH

(4) (9)

CF: 6002

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH
AT BILASPUR

W.P. NO. 5021 / 2006

Petitioner :

Ajay Yadav
S/o Ram Vriksh Yadav,
Aged about 32 years,
R/o Kotrahit Presently residing at
Wadraf Nagar, Tehsil – Wadruf
Nagar, Dist : Sarguja-(C.G.)

P.R. No. 4507/06
Presented by Shri D.N. Yadav
dated 12/12/06

Versus

Respondents :

1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through The Secretary
Department of Panchayat
D.K.S. Bhawan Mantralaya,
Raipur, Dist : Raipur-(C.G.)

2. The Director
Panchayat Raipur, Dist : Raipur-
(C.G.)

3. The Collector,
Sarguja, Dist : Sarguja-(C.G.)

4. The Chief Executive Officer,
Janpad Panchayat
Wadruf Nagar, Tehsil – Wadruf
Nagar, Dist : Sarguja-(C.G.)

5. The Tehsildar
Wadruf Nagar,
Dist : Sarguja-(C.G)

6. Abhishek Yadav
S/o Shri Akand Yadav,
R/o Kotrahi,
Tehsil – Wadruf Nagar,
Dist : Sarguja-(C.G.)

7. Haricharan Kushwaha
S/o Nanku Ram
R/o Village Pedari,
Tehsil – Wadruf Nagar,
Dist : Sarguja-(C.G.)

OATH COMMISSIONER
APARNA MALVIYA
CG-17/2006
17/12/06
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

RECEIVED-COPY
18/12/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

(3) ~~(2)~~

(2)

WRIT PETITION U/A 226 / 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

WP(C)5224/06

XI-HC-22

(40)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ...W.P..5021.. सन् 2006

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

13.9.2006

Petitioner by Shri Raghavendra Pradhan, Advocate.

State/respondents No. 1, 2, 3 and 5 by Shri Sushil Dubey, Government Advocate.

Heard.

By way of this writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the validity of order dated 14.8.2006(Annexure P-1), passed by respondent No.2, The Director, Panchayat Raipur in Panchayat appeal No.76/A-89/05-06.

A perusal of the order would show that against the order dated 26.06.2006, passed by the District Collector, Ambikapur in Panchayat case No.9/B-121/04-05, the petitioner has preferred the aforesaid appeal before the appellate authority i.e. respondent No.2. The appellate authority, after hearing the parties, has dismissed the stay application preferred by the petitioner in the said appeal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the appeal itself is listed for hearing on today i.e. 13.9.2006, but it is likely to be adjourned as it has already been adjourned on an earlier occasion. He makes a limited prayer that the appellate authority be directed to dispose of the appeal at the earliest.

This limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner is not opposed by learned counsel for the State.

It is directed that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the appellate authority shall try to dispose of this appeal at the earliest, if the appeal is not disposed of as on today, preferably within a period of 3 months from the date of production of certified copy of this order and a copy of writ petition.

Sd/-
Sunil Kumar Sinha
Judge

sunita

29.9.06 18.10.06